



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,878	09/28/2001	Michael Patrick Bushe	EMC01-12(01047)	4264

7590 06/17/2004

Barry W. Chapin, Esq.
CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C.
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, MA 01581

EXAMINER

GOLINKOFF, JORDAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/966,878

Applicant(s)

BUSHE ET AL.

Examiner

Jordan S Golinkoff

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - Page 4, line 10 – “atom” should be changed to “atoms”
 - Page 6, line 11 – “resources was” should be changed to “resources and was”
 - Page 7, lines 2-3 – “fact conventional” should be changed to “fact that conventional”

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 2-5, 7-14, 18, 20-21, 23-9, and 32 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - Claims 2-5, 7-14, 18, 20-21, 23-9, and 32 have a parenthetical statement above them that is a brief synopsis of the claimed elements. These statements should be removed.
 - Claim 26 currently depends on claim 2. However, it seems that claim 26 should depend on claim 18. Examiner will assume that claim 26 depends on claim 18 not claim 2 for the examination of this application.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2174

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 17, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rangarajan et al. ("Rangarajan," US006275225B1).

As per independent claim 1, Rangarajan teaches that in a computer system for managing resources, a method for displaying managed object data associated with managed resources, the method comprising the steps of receiving at least one managed object selection and receiving a task selection to apply to the at least one managed object selection (column 1, 12-16 and 31-34, *i.e. – selecting network objects and performing network management functions on these objects*); identifying at least one view definition corresponding to the task selection that defines a view with which to display managed object data related to the at least one managed object selection (column 9, lines 12-15 and 49-52); displaying the view corresponding to the at least one view definition on a graphical user interface of the computer system (column 9, lines 49-52); obtaining the managed object data related to the at least one managed object selection (column 4, lines 59-67 and column 10, lines 10-13); and displaying the managed object data related to the at least one managed object selection within the view on the graphical user interface of the computer system (column 9, lines 49-52).

Claims 17, 30, and 31 are similar in scope to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

5. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Besaw (US 20020198973A1).

Art Unit: 2174

As per independent claim 14, Besaw teaches that in a management server computer system, a method providing access to managed object data, the method comprising the steps of parsing a view definitions document, an object definitions document and an object data document to create a data dictionary containing a master view definition, task definitions, view definitions and managed object data definitions, the data dictionary further defining, for each task definition, at least one use case that defines a mapping of at least one view definition to a portion of at least one managed object data definition (§26-30, *i.e.* – *customized management services and views*, and §49); detecting an initiation of a resource management process (§46); and passing the data dictionary to the resource management process to allow the resource management process to process the data dictionary (§46, *i.e.* – *accessing a database to find customer portals*).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, Besaw teaches the steps of receiving a request from a resource management process for managed object data associated with a particular managed resource (§29-30, *i.e.* – *viewing information about networked objects*); invoking operation of a resource agent operating in conjunction with the managed resource to produce and return the managed object data (§35); receiving the managed object data from the resource agent; and providing the managed object data to the resource management process (§35).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Besaw teaches that the method operates in a resource management application used for management of managed resources in a storage area network environment (§28) and wherein the view definitions document, the object definitions document are XML documents defining task selections that can be applied to

Art Unit: 2174

managed object selections, and that further define, for certain combinations of task selections and object selections, a use' case that references a view definition that defines a view and references managed object data that is to be displayed in the view according to a style definition (§27 and §44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2-13, 18-29, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangarajan et al. ("Rangarajan," US006275225B1) in further view of Besaw (US 20020198973A1).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, the teachings of Rangarajan in regards to claim 1 have been discussed above. Rangarajan does not disclose the steps of: retrieving a data dictionary containing a master view definition, task definitions, view definitions and managed object data definitions, the data dictionary further defining, for each task definition, at least one use case that defines a mapping of at least one view definition to a portion of at least one managed object data definition; and displaying the master view definition on the graphical user interface such that a user of the computer system can provide the at least one managed object selection and a task selection that are received in the step of receiving.

Art Unit: 2174

Besaw teaches the steps of: retrieving a data dictionary containing a master view definition, task definitions, view definitions and managed object data definitions, the data dictionary further defining, for each task definition, at least one use case that defines a mapping of at least one view definition to a portion of at least one managed object data definition (§26-30, *i.e. – customized management services and views*, and §49); and displaying the master view definition on the graphical user interface such that a user of the computer system can provide the at least one managed object selection and a task selection that are received in the step of receiving (§27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Rangarajan with the ability to store definitions of different tasks, objects, and views, as taught by Besaw, with the motivation to display only relevant information to a manager of a network (§10).

Claims 18 and 32 are similar in scope to claim 2 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, the combination of Rangarajan and Besaw teach that the step of identifying at least one view definition corresponding to the task selection comprises the steps of selecting a task definition in the data dictionary that corresponds to the task selection (§27); and for each of the at least one object selection, selecting a use case that is associated with the task definition in the data dictionary and that corresponds to the at least one object selection, the use case identifying a view definition defining a view in which to display managed object data related to the at least one managed object selection to which a management function associated with the task selection is applied (§27 and §31, *i.e. – selecting and defining user views*).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 2, the combination of Rangarajan and Besaw teach that the step of displaying the view definition comprises the steps of for each of the at least one view definition identified in the step of identifying: i) retrieving a view type from the at least one view definition in the data dictionary, the view type defining a view to be displayed on the graphical user interface of the computer system (column 9, lines 49-52); and ii) rendering a view corresponding to the view type on the graphical user interface of the computer system (column 9-10, lines 59-5).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, the combination of Rangarajan and Besaw teach that the step of rendering a view corresponding to the view type renders the view according to a view style defined in the data dictionary (column 7, lines 42-61).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 5, the combination of Rangarajan and Besaw teach that the view style defines a view corresponding to at least one of a map, a tree and a graph (column 7, lines 45-56, *i.e. – a topology view*).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 2, the combination of Rangarajan and Besaw teach that the step of obtaining the managed object data comprises the steps of consulting the at least one view definition in the data dictionary to identify the managed object data references related to the at least one managed object selection that reference managed object data that is to be displayed in the view definition (column 9, lines 49-52); and obtaining the managed object data based upon managed object data references (column 4, lines 59-67 and column 10, lines 10-13).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, the combination of Rangarajan and Besaw teach that the step of obtaining the managed object data includes the step of determining

Art Unit: 2174

if the managed object data is contained in the data dictionary, and if the managed object data is contained in the data dictionary, the managed object data is obtained from the data dictionary, and if the managed object data is not contained in the data dictionary, the managed object data is obtained from a management server that provides the managed object data (column 4, lines 10-13 and column 10, lines 10-13).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 7, the combination of Rangarajan and Besaw teach that the step of obtaining the managed object data further comprises the steps of invoking a management function associated with the task selection upon managed object data associated with at least one of the at least one managed object selection to produce managed object data. which is referenced by the managed object data references defined within the view definition (§27, *i.e.* – *management services*).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 2, the combination of Rangarajan and Besaw teach that the step of displaying the managed object data comprises the steps of providing the view displayed on the graphical user interface of the computer system with the managed object data obtained as a result of the step of obtaining; and rendering the managed object data in the view (columns 9-10, lines 49-5).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, the combination of Rangarajan and Besaw teach that the step of rendering the managed object data renders the managed object data according to a managed object data style defined in the data dictionary for the managed object data (column 7, lines 42-61).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 2, the combination of Rangarajan and Besaw teach that the data dictionary is a document object model based upon parsing operations

Art Unit: 2174

performed on a collection of markup language statements that define task definitions, view definitions, and object definitions (§44 and §49).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, the combination of Rangarajan and Besaw teach that the object definitions in the document object model define attributes and data of resources in a storage area network environment (§44-46); the task definitions identify resource management functions which may be applied to the resources in the storage area network environment (§44-46 and §27); and wherein the step of obtaining the managed object data includes the step of applying a resource management function associated with the task selection upon a resource in the storage area network environment corresponding to the managed object selection to produce managed object data which is referenced by the managed object data references defined within the view definition (§27 and column 9-10, lines 59-5); and wherein the step of displaying the managed object data displays the managed object data in the graphical user interface to allow a user of the computer system to view results of application of the resource management function on the resources in storage area network environment (§27 and column 9-10, lines 59-5).

Claims 19-29 are similar in scope to claims 3-13, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gupta (US 20030009543A1) and Mokuya et al. (US 20030046381A1) teach a means to manage networks by converting XML definition information to management operations.

Steve Steinke ("Network Systems Management with XML") teaches defining objects, tasks, relationships, and views using an XML dictionary of definitions for these objects.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jordan S Golinkoff whose telephone number is 703-305-8771. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jordan Golinkoff
Patent Examiner
June 4, 2004

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100